UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

CSC HOLDINGS, LLC and CABLEVISION SYSTEMS, NEW YORK CITY CORPORATION

and Cases 29-CA-134419
29-CA-135428
COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF 29-CA-135822
AMERICA, AFL-CIO 29-CA-136759
29-CA-137214
29-CA-142425

ORDER1

The General Counsel's request for special permission to appeal the July 23, 2015 and July 30, 2015 rulings of Administrative Law Judge Raymond Green is denied. The General Counsel has failed to establish that the judge abused his discretion.²

Dated, Washington, D.C., September 9, 2015.

MARK GASTON PEARCE, CHAIRMAN

PHILIP A. MISCIMARRA, MEMBER

LAUREN McFERRAN, MEMBER

¹ The National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

² Although we deny the General Counsel's Request for Special Permission to Appeal, we reject the Respondent's contention that the request was untimely because it was not filed promptly. Sec. 102.26 of the Board's Rules and Regulations does not specify an exact time frame for filing a request to file a special appeal, other than to say that it should be filed "promptly." The General Counsel filed the request for special permission to appeal within 26 days from the judge's ruling. There is no indication that any party has suffered prejudice due to the 26 days that elapsed between the judge's ruling and the filing of the request. In the absence of any showing of prejudice, we regard the submission as having been filed within the requirements of the rule. See generally *Excel DPM of Arkansas, Inc.*, 324 NLRB 880, 880 fn. 1 (1997) (rejecting a respondent's argument that the General Counsel's motion for summary judgment should be denied as untimely because it was not filed "promptly" within the meaning of Sec. 102.24(b) of the Board's Rules and Regulations, where the respondent did not show that it suffered prejudice due to the lapse of 5 months between the General Counsel's receipt of its answer to the complaint and the filing of the motion).